APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,910	01/11/2002	Frank Lee	TRNDP006	7252

22434	7590	05/26/2005

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 70250
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER
ALOMARI, FIRAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/043,910	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Firas Alomari	2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 January 2002_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-35_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _1-35_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _11 January 2002_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2.   Claims 24 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. It's not clear to the examiner which request being modified and why. Examiner will interpret the claims to their broadest reasonable interpretation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1-9, 11,13-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ji et al US (5,889,943).

Regarding claims 1 and 27: Ji discloses a system for identifying undesirable

content in responses sent in reply to a user request for content (See Abstract),

the system comprising:

a user input device that generates a request for content including an address of a

target server; (Col 5 lines 33-35; Col 11, lines 48-53 and Item 800 of FIG 8A)

a scan module that receives the user request for content and identifies the

request as a request for content; (Col 11, lines 19-24)

a proxy module that modifies the request for content to be redirected to a proxy

server; (Col 11, lines 35-41)

a network that routes the request for content to the proxy server; (Col 12, Lines

8-11) and

a proxy server that receives the request, forwards the request to the target

server, and receives a response from the target server. (Col 12, Lines 14-16)

Regarding claim 2: Ji discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the proxy server

identifies undesirable content in the response and processes the response

according to defined parameters. (Col 12, Lines 27-38)

Regarding claim 3: Ji discloses the system of claim 2, wherein the proxy server

sends at least a portion of the response to the user, the portion of the response

not including the undesirable content. (Col 12, Lines 43-60)

Regarding claim 4: Ji discloses the system of claim 2, wherein the proxy server

sends a notification message back to the user, the notification message containing data related to the undesirable content. (Col 12, Lines 43-60)

Regarding claim 5: Ji discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising: a user preference module that receives user-defined parameters utilized by the proxy server when processing the response. (Col 9, lines 34-38 and Col 12, lines 36-41)

Regarding claims 6, 19 and 31: Ji discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the proxy module redirects the request to the proxy server by modifying the request. (Col 8, Lines 33-48 and Col 7, lines 33-41)

Regarding claims 7, 20 and 32: Ji discloses the system of claim 6, wherein the proxy module modifies the request by adding a redirection destination header to the request. (the examiner deem this feature to be inherent to any proxy communication system where the proxy modifies the request by changing the address to enable the proxy to relay all inbound and outbound communication without making a direct connection between the source and destination)

Regarding claim 8: Ji discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the proxy server further quarantines undesirable content. (Col 9, Lines 40-45)

Regarding claims 9 and 26: Ji disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the

undesirable content is a junk e-mail message, a computer virus, or pornographic

material. (Col 3, lines 55-62)

Regarding claim 11: The system of claim 1, wherein the defined parameters are

user-defined parameters. (Col 9, Lines 34-39)

Regarding claim 13: Ji discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the scan module

and the proxy module are located in a network gateway device. (Col 6, Lines 18-

25)

Regarding claim 14: Ji discloses the system of claim 5, wherein the scan module

and the proxy module are located in a network gateway device. (Col 6, Lines 25-

31 and Col 7, lines 41-46)

Regarding claim 15: Ji discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the network

gateway device further comprises a firewall and a router.(Col 6, lines 1-7 and Col

8, lines 25-28)

Regarding claim 16: Ji discloses a method for identifying undesirable content in

responses sent in reply to a user request for content, the method comprising:

receiving input from a user including at least one request for content addressed

to a target server; (Col 11, lines 48-53 and Item 800 of FIG 8A)

identifying the request for content; (Col 11, lines 19-24)

redirecting the request for content to a proxy server; (Col 11, lines 35-41)

receiving the request for content at the proxy server; (Col 12, Lines 8-11)

sending the request for content from the proxy server to the target server for

generation of a response; (Col 12, Lines 14-16)

receiving the response from the target server at the proxy server;(Col 10, Lines

16-19)

scanning the response for undesirable content; (Col 10, lines 29-33)

and processing the response according to defined parameters. (Col 9, lines 34-

44)

Regarding claim 17: Ji The method of claim 16, further comprising:

identifying undesirable content in the response; (Col 12, lines 33-36)

modifying the response to remove the undesirable content; (Col 12, lines 47-49)

and

sending the modified response from the proxy server to the user. (Col 12, lines

54-60)

Regarding claim 18: Ji discloses the method of claim 16, wherein the request for

content is identified by examining the request protocol. (Col 8, lines 32-41)

Regarding claims 21 and 33: Ji discloses the method of claim 16, wherein the request for content is redirected to the proxy server by establishing a session with the proxy server. (Col 7, lines 32-41) .

Regarding claim 22: Ji discloses the method of claim 16, further comprising: receiving input of at least one user-defined parameter for use by the proxy server in processing the undesirable content. (Col 9, lines 34-47)

Regarding claims 23: Ji discloses the method of claim 22, wherein the user-defined parameter is input using a browser application. (Col 9, lines 34-38)

Regarding claims 24 and 34: Ji discloses the method of claim 22, wherein the user-defined parameter is sent to the proxy server by modifying the request. (Col 10, lines 48-55)

Regarding claims 25 and 35: Ji discloses the method of claim 22, wherein the user-defined parameter is sent to the proxy server during a session established with the proxy server. (Col 9, lines 47-51)

regarding claim 28: Ji discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 27, further comprising: receiving at least one user-defined parameter related to processing of the response by the proxy server. (Col 9, lines 34-47)

Regarding claim 29: Ji discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 28,

wherein the user-defined parameter is utilized by the proxy server in processing

a response that includes undesirable content. (Col 12, Lines 27-38)

. Regarding claim 30: Ji discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 28,

further comprising: a database for storing the at least one user-defined

parameter. (Col 12, lines 35-43)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

4.   Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ji et al US (5,889,943) in view of Bates et al. US (6,779,021).

Regarding claim 10: Ji discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the defined

parameters are a modifiable configurations according to the user input(Col 7,

lines 34-38) but he doesn't disclose the defined parameters being proxy server

default parameters. However bates disclose a system detecting undesirable

content in email messages (Col 3, lines 40-54) where he teaches the using of

rules to handle spam messages those rules are default settings by the server(Col

11 , lines 33-44) or a user designated rules. Therefore it would have been

obvious to one ordinary skilled in art at the time the invention was made to

modify Ji's invention with the teaching of Bates to define default parameters to

processes the messages. One would be motivated to do so in order to enable the

system to provide basic protection against obvious undesirable content even if

there are no parameters defined by the user or the user parameters are not

sufficient.

Regarding claim 12: Ji discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the defined

parameters are a modifiable configurations according to the user input(Col 7,

lines 34-38) but he doesn't disclose the defined parameters are a combination of

user-defined parameters and proxy server default parameters. However bates

disclose a system detecting undesirable content in email messages (Col 3, lines

40-54) where he teaches the using of rules to handle spam messages those

rules are default settings by the server(Col 11 , lines 33-44) or a user designated

rules or a combination between the default rules and the user specified rules(Col

12, lines 11-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in

art at the time the invention was made to modify Ji's invention with the teaching

of Bates to define a combination of the user defined parameters and the default

parameters to processes the messages. One would be motivated to do so in

order to provide flexibility to the system such that it can accommodate user

preferences and learn new rules of undesirable content that were unknown to the

system before while at the same time providing the minimum required protection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Firas Alomari whose telephone number is

(571) 272-7963. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 7:30 am -

4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, AYAZ SHEIKH can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

                                                    Firas Alomari
                                                    Examiner
                                                    Art Unit 2136

FA

                                                    AYAZ SHEIKH
                                            SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
                                               TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100